

Edward Stankiewicz

Grammars  
and Dictionaries  
of the Slavic Languages  
from the Middle Ages  
up to 1850

An Annotated Bibliography

Mouton Publishers  
Berlin · New York · Amsterdam

016.4918

General Slavic Ref.

St 2g

(SUAU)

cop. 2

## Table of Contents

Foreword . . . . .	vii
--------------------	-----

### *West Slavic*

<b>CZECH</b>	
Grammars . . . . .	3
Dictionaries . . . . .	16
<b>SLOVAK</b>	
Grammars . . . . .	25
Dictionaries . . . . .	28
<b>POLISH</b>	
Grammars . . . . .	33
Dictionaries . . . . .	45
<b>SORBIAN</b>	
Grammars . . . . .	61
Dictionaries . . . . .	63

### *South Slavic*

<b>BULGARIAN</b>	
Grammars . . . . .	69
Dictionaries . . . . .	72
<b>CROATIAN</b>	
Grammars . . . . .	77
Dictionaries . . . . .	84
<b>SERBIAN</b>	
Grammars . . . . .	94
Dictionaries . . . . .	96
<b>SLOVENE</b>	
Grammars . . . . .	98
Dictionaries . . . . .	103

Slavic

*East Slavic*

RUSSIAN	
Grammars . . . . .	113
Dictionaries . . . . .	127
UKRAINIAN	
Grammars . . . . .	147
Dictionaries . . . . .	151
Index of Authors . . . . .	159
Index of Cities with Variant Names . . . . .	169
Secondary Bibliography . . . . .	171
List of Facsimiles and Critical Editions . . . . .	187

## Foreword

This book is the outgrowth of a research project on the formation of the Slavic National Languages which was granted by the Ford Foundation to the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures at Yale University ten years ago. While the other volumes issuing from this project dealt with political, cultural, and linguistic processes that led to the formation of the modern Slavic literary languages,<sup>1</sup> this volume has the more specific purpose of providing an insight into the orthographic, grammatical, and lexicographical works which have over the ages contributed to the crystallization of a Slavic national consciousness, to the formation of the Slavic literary languages, and to the knowledge of the Slavic languages and dialects. It is precisely in these works that the rights to autonomy and literary status of the Slavic languages were articulated in the most eloquent and emphatic terms (particularly in the prefaces to the grammars and dictionaries), and that the distinctive as well as the common features of the Slavic languages were described in the most comprehensive and explicit form.

In addition to contributing to a better understanding of the history of the Slavic literary languages, this volume is thus intended in the first place as a guide to the history of Slavic grammatical thought as reflected in the grammars and dictionaries that came from the desks of Slavic and non-Slavic scholars from about 1400 until about 1850. The cut-off date 1850 was suggested by the fact that most Slavic literary languages (except Byelorussian and Macedonian) were formed by then. For a bibliography of Slavic linguistic works written in the second half of the 19th century the reader may consult a *Selected Bibliography of Slavic Linguistics* by E. Stankiewicz and D. Worth (2 vols., 1966; 1970), which in effect forms a companion piece of this volume.

The original "National Languages" character of the project has also dictated the omission of works that deal with the historical elaboration of Church Slavonic and with the attempts at artificial all-Slavic languages. For the older history of the former, Jagić's *Rassuždenija južnoslavjanskoj i ruskoj stariny o cerkovnoslavjanskom jazyke* (1896) is still an unsurpassed source, whereas the works on the latter are easily available in an ever growing literature (particularly in works devoted to the most astute Panslavist and linguist of his time, Juraj Križanić). On the other hand, I have included works of either type (e. g., Zizaniĵ, Berynda, Smotryč'kyj; Herkel, Majar), insofar as they affected the history of the Slavic national languages by either fostering or hampering their growth. I have also omitted works of secondary importance, especially in the case of languages with rich grammatical traditions (such as "azbukovniki", primers and school grammars), as well as dictionaries of exotic languages. But as the latter made their appearance fairly late (in the 18th and 19th centuries), they had little bearing on the direction of Slavic grammatical thought.

In the annotations that follow the individual entries I have greatly profited from the books and monographs that have come out in recent years (for a list of these, see the attached Secondary Bibliography). None of these works, however, offers a survey of the linguistic traditions of all the Slavs, and their emphasis is not so much on this as on the formation of the Slavic literary languages.

The most comprehensive work dealing with the study of language among the Slavs is still Jagić's outstanding *Istorija slavjanskoj filologije* (1910), though Jagić too treated the problems of language rather tangentially, i. e., within his broadly conceived conception of Slavic philology, a discipline that would encompass the cultural, ethnographic, and linguistic history of the Slavs. This emphasis on "Geistesgeschichte" accounts for the special attention he devoted to the founders of Slavic philology (such as Dobrovský, Kopitar, Šafařík, Vostokov, Vuk) and for the sketchy treatment accorded the earlier linguistic developments and traditions. Jagić, no doubt, also shared the nineteenth-century conviction that the true history of linguistics began with the discovery of historical-comparative grammar and, in the Slavic context, with the study of Old Church Slavonic and older texts. A broader approach to the questions of language is found in the book by B. Otwinowska, *Język-Naród-Kultura* (1974), which is nevertheless circumscribed in time (the Renaissance) and in space (it covers only Poland).

The many-sided study of the history of Slavic grammatical thought therefore remains to be done, and this bibliography is offered as a limited but indispensable step toward this end. Since the development of language study among the Slavs has been largely ignored in Western linguistic historiography, it seems appropriate at this point to indicate the main lines of that development and to show in what way it coincided with or diverged from the study of language in the West, and what it owes to it.

The emergence of "a linguistic problem" of the Slavs was almost coterminous with their appearance on the historical arena. The activities of the Slavic Apostles, Cyril and Methodius, posited from the very beginning the question of the equality of languages, of the admission of the vernacular in the Church, and of its right to a distinctive system of writing. The suppression of the Slavic liturgy in most Western Slavic lands did not thwart the aspirations of their peoples to cultural and linguistic independence, but postponed their realization until a time when they would re-emerge in a new and more articulate form. That time came, as in Western Europe, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, which witnessed the formation of modern ethnic entities and states and of new national languages.

It was during the Renaissance and Reformation that the supremacy of the Church and of universal Latin gave way to new forms of national and literary expression. But unlike the West, where the defense of the "living" vernaculars went hand in hand with the rejection of "dead" Latin,<sup>2</sup> the Slavic peoples advanced the rights of their vernaculars in the name of a linguistic and cultural continuity and of a return to the original Slavic source. The work of the Slavic Apostles provided the model and inspiration for the translation of the Gospels into the new national languages, for their admission in secular and sacred af-

fairs, as well as for the creation of new Slavic alphabets. It is in this spirit that the Emperor Charles IV established the Emmaus monastery in Prague with the help of the South Slavic "glagoljaši," that the Polish king Władysław Jagiełło introduced the Slavic liturgy (*na Kleparzu*), and that Jan Hus and Adam Bohorič created their new Slavic alphabets in Latin letters. But it is above all the Bible translations, initiated by Protestants and Catholics alike, which fostered the equality of the Slavic languages with the three "holy" languages, and which became the workshop in which the Slavic vernaculars acquired their flexibility and richness, and in which their modern literary norms were forged. Thus, some of the earliest and best Slavic grammars (Bohorič's of Slovene, J. Blahoslav's of Czech, Smotryč'kyj's of Church Slavonic, Chojanus' of Sorbian) made their appearance only in the wake of outstanding Bible translations (Dalmatin's in Slovenia, the Kralice Bible in Bohemia, the Ostrog Bible in the Ukraine, Jakubica's New Testament in Sorbia). Church Slavonic in one or another local form together with the Greek Orthodox Church remained, of course, the bond which would tie together all Orthodox Slavdom until the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Rather than foster a rupture between the modern Slavic languages and the older literary language of the Slavs, Slavic grammarians, historians and writers kept alive for centuries the memory of their common origin and patrimony, a memory that was confirmed by the identity of their name (*slověnski*) despite the great diversity of local designations (*Wendic, Illyrian, Dalmatian, Polish*, etc.). In asserting the autonomy of their languages vis-à-vis the languages of the West with their alleged provenience from "noble" classical languages (i. e. from Latin or from Greek), the Slavs created their own pedigrees that would relate them to Homer's Henei or to the heirs of Alexander the Great, and they glorified their language as "famous" (from *slava*), "ancient," "generous," "holy" (in part because of its link to St. Jerome, the presumed translator of the Vulgate into Slavic) and "universal," inasmuch as it was spoken all the way from the Adriatic up to the White Sea.

Just as they were eager to emphasize their continuity with the past, the Slavic writers and grammarians were also keen on pointing up their linguistic continuity in space, viewing the individual Slavic languages as mere dialectal varieties of one ideal, supranational language. This view explains the recurrent comparisons drawn between Slavic and classical Greek (with its diverse literary dialects), which recur in the works of Slavic historians and grammarians beginning with St. Orzechowski and Jan Blahoslav up to Jernej Kopitar and Josef Dohrovský.

The greeting extended by Charles IV to the Serbian tsar Stefan Dušan (in 1355) could well have served as the banner under which the Slavs would rally at various points in their history: *eiusdem nobilis slavici idiomatis participatio, eiusdem generosae linguae sublimitas*.<sup>3</sup> Unlike the nations in the West, which vied fiercely for the cultural priority and presumed natural superiority of their languages (reflected in the unending controversies between the Italians and the French or between the Florentines and the Northern Italians), the Slavs were the first to formulate a program of a "panslavic" community which was daily corroborated by the similarity of their customs, history, and languages. The

awareness of their linguistic affinity gave rise to such basically anachronistic schemes as Križanić's attempt at a common Slavic language, or to such pervasive political and cultural movements as "Illyrianism" (among the Southern Slavs) and 'vzájemnost' ("reciprocity"), which were seriously entertained well into the beginning of the nineteenth century. It accounted, further, for the intimate collaboration of Slavic scholars of various countries and creeds (e.g. between Dobrovský and Kopitar, between Kopitar and Vuk) and ultimately for Vuk's successful effort in unifying the Croats and Serbs under a common literary language.

The sentiment of linguistic and cultural unity also left a permanent mark on the quality of the Slavic grammars and dictionaries that were being produced with an eye to a broader, all-Slavic audience, and that borrowed from each other grammatical concepts, terms and everyday vocabulary. These borrowings not only enriched the lexical stocks of the individual languages, but deepened the sense of their unity and their actual similarity.

The desire to go beyond the confines of one's own language is apparent in the earliest works of the Protestants (e.g. in Dalmatin's *Register* and in Bohorič's Slovene grammar [of 1584] which were destined for all Southern Slavs), and continues to inform the all-Slavic orientation of grammatical and lexicographic works as far as the eighteenth and nineteenth century (e.g. Linde's dictionary of Polish of 1807-14, which incorporates words from all Slavic languages). The influence these works exercised upon each other, both in content and style, can be traced across the map of the whole Slavic world; e.g. Hus' influence on the Polish orthographic treatises of Parkosz and Zaborowski; Vrančić's on the seven-language dictionary of the Czech Loderecker; Rosa's and Loderecker's on the works of the Slovenian monk Pohlin; Linde's contribution to the Czech dictionary of Jungmann. The list of such intra- and inter-Slavic influences can be greatly extended, and they would themselves make an interesting subject of research.

The quest for interdependence and unity, which shaped the cultural relations between the Slavs, and which was particularly intense among their minor nations, was at the same time counteracted by the opposite tendency – towards individuation and differentiation. This tug of centripetal and centrifugal forces, or what the French Slavist André Vaillant called the "attraction and repulsion" of the Slavic peoples, had important consequences also for Slavic grammatical theory and practice.

Works that stressed the primacy of their own languages over others began to make their appearance during the Counter Reformation, i.e., when the national, religious, and linguistic differences among the Slavic countries became more pronounced. The new patriotic attitude is already reflected in L. Górnicki's *Dworzanin polski* (1566), a work which was inspired by Castiglione's *Il Cortegiano*, but which was adapted to the linguistic situation in Poland. In it the author gives not only the customary catalogue of Slavic nations, but promotes the cause of Polish vis-à-vis the other Slavic languages and Latin. He disapproves of the Polish fascination with Czech ("an effeminate language"), describes the South

Slavic languages as "pagan" (because of their contamination by Turkish), puts under question the intrinsic superiority of Russian (i.e., Russian Church Slavonic), and pleads for *własne polskie słowo* ("one's own Polish word") in place of Latin borrowings. In a similar vein the Polish historian Kromer, the promulgator of the Sarmatian origin of the Poles, insists on the uniqueness and superiority of Polish. The Slavic languages, he claims, may all have sprung from a common source, but the passage of time has made them so different that their speakers "can hardly communicate with each other." According to J. Rybiński, the author of *De linguarum in genere ...* (1589), Polish is the queen of the Slavic languages, surpassing them in elegance and flexibility, although it has some sounds that are difficult for speakers of other languages. The Polonized Frenchman Mesgnien maintains (in his grammar of 1649) that Polish is the most *constans et nobilissima lingua*, while Jan Blahoslav (in 1570) ascribes such qualities only to Czech. The emphasis on the *proprietates et idiotismi* of their own Slavic language (V. Rosa), of its singular *własności* (Seklucjan) or *svojtva* (Smotryc'kyj) is a theme which appears with ever greater frequency in works of a linguistic and political character. Of particular interest is here Rosa's encomium of the Czech language (in the preface to his grammar of 1672) as one that is endowed with *venustas et nervositas*, with the greatest number of sounds, with a poetry based on quantitative meters (*metrice*, not *rimice*), with the richest system of verbal aspects and an opulence of diminutives and derived nouns (*varietas nominum*). The recurring apologias for one's native language were not merely exercises in self-satisfaction, but often had the more pressing purpose of fending off the encroachments of other, more powerful Slavic languages. Such a motivation was obviously behind Smotryc'kyj's grammar, which defended the position of Church Slavonic, the language of Orthodoxy, in the face of the Union and Polish political expansion. The striving towards national self-determination under the umbrella of Slavic cultural unity received the most poignant expression in the program of the Ukrainian Fraternity of Cyril and Methodius (in 1846): "We declare," it stated, "that all Slavs should unite ... But in such a way that each nation build its own republic and be governed separately so that each nation have its own language, literature and social order."<sup>4</sup> All these efforts and declarations could not but drive home the point that amidst their similarity the Slavic languages exhibit great dissimilarities and that they have largely developed along different historical paths. Such a conclusion must have imposed itself above all upon a long line of authors (such as Hus, Zaborowski, Bohorič, Križanić, Budinić, Belostenec, Vuk, and Gaj) who embarked on reforms of the Slavic alphabets, an activity that presupposed a subtle understanding of their underlying phonemic systems and an awareness of their distinction from other languages or older stages of their own language. The tendency to compare the various phases of a language and the need to state the distinctive traits of their dialects or languages with relation to other Slavic and non-Slavic languages (in particular Latin) sharpened the comparative outlook of the Slavs and laid the groundwork for a Slavic linguistic typology long before the advent of the modern science of language and of the comparative-historical method.

Another important aspect of the Slavic grammatical and lexicographical tradition is its relation to the linguistic thought of the West. Western linguistic influences on the Slavs can be traced back to the fifteenth century when the teachings of the Modistae worked their way into the university curriculum (at Cracow), and they persisted uninterrupted throughout the following centuries. The Slavic authors were keenly aware of the linguistic controversies in the West (as in the above-mentioned work of Górnicki), while some of their grammarians were in personal contact with the most outstanding Humanists of Europe (e.g., Bohorič's apprenticeship to Melanchthon and Mączyński's to Bibliander). Erasmus's ideas penetrated many philological works and gave a decisive impetus to Slavic paroemiology, which was treated as the most palpable expression of the "genius" of a given language (cf. the vast number of proverbs in the dictionaries of Mączyński, Megiser and Knapski).<sup>5</sup> In addition to the ubiquitous Priscian and Donatus, the Slavs early became acquainted with and profited from the works of the leading Renaissance grammarians and lexicographers of the West, such as Laskaris, Alvarez, R. Estienne, Calepinus, Pomey and Dasypodius. In the seventeenth century Western Europe itself acquired an intense and almost insatiable interest in the Slavic languages and antiquities and in the hitherto unaccessible linguistic riches of Russia, attracting to this study such eminent polymaths and linguists as Leibniz, Sparvenfeld, Hiob Ludolf, La Croze and Eckhart. This interest found a sympathetic response and financial patronage on the part of Peter I and Catherine the Great, leading to such gigantic linguistic enterprises as the catalogues of all languages produced by Pallas and Janković de Mirievo. Pointless as they might have subsequently appeared, these ventures led to a vast expansion of the linguistic horizons. The eighteenth century taste for "rational" and "universal" grammars found an equally sympathetic echo in Poland and in Russia, which actively participated in the advance, as well as demise, of this tradition through the works of such authors as Kopczyński, Lomonosov, Jazvickij, Kurganov, Maudru, Becker and many others. The nineteenth-century discovery of the comparative method finally put Slavic philology on an equal footing with Western linguistic scholarship.

The study of the Slavic languages owes a special debt to the foreign scholars who settled in the Slavic countries and acquired first-hand knowledge of their languages and cultures. It is striking that the first grammars and dictionaries of the major Slavic languages were written by Western travellers and scholars, such as Stojeński (Statorius) and Mesgnien in Poland, and W. Ludolf, Groening, Sparvenfeld and Schlözer in Russia. No less important was the contribution of foreigners to the advancement of the South Slavic languages, sponsored in part by the Protestants and in part by the Roman Curia. Thus the great polyglot Megiser placed Slovene in the company of the most prestigious languages of Europe (in his quadrilingual dictionary of 1592), whereas the Italian Jesuits J. Migaglia (Mikalja) and Della Bella promoted the linguistic stature of Bosnian as the most "universal" and "beautiful" dialect of the Southern Slavs, thereby preparing the ground for Vuk's selection of jekavian štokavian as the norm of the modern Serbo-Croatian literary language.

Slavic philology is also indebted to those Hebrew grammarians who left us the oldest (11th to 13th centuries) glosses and grammatical descriptions of K'naanic, the Slavic language of medieval East European Jewry.<sup>6</sup> J. Schröpfer was no doubt right in assuming that Hus's use of diacritic marks was inspired by the Jewish practice of rendering in Hebrew the Slavic palatal consonants.<sup>7</sup> The Jews who inspired Hus's reform were clearly the same Jews who lived in the Bohemian milieu and who were largely supportive of the Hussite cause.

It is finally my pleasure to thank all those who contributed to the advance of this work. Foremost thanks are due to the former and present graduate students at Yale who participated in the various stages of the project: to Micaela S. Iovine, who verified and completed the Bulgarian section, and to Jack Schreiber and Susanne Fusso, who helped throughout with the technical aspects of the work. The latter has prepared most of the Secondary Bibliography. Dr. Olga Nedeljković was helpful at the initial stage of the research.

This project could not have been completed without the help of some Polish scholars and the support of IREX, which sponsored a collaborative project of the Yale Slavic Department and the University of Katowice on the history of Slavic grammatical thought. Although this project never got off the ground, it enabled me to visit Poland on several occasions, to consult there some primary sources and to profit from the help and advice of the following colleagues: Dr. M. Basaj, Dr. W. Kryzia, Prof. K. Polański, Ms. M. Turkowska, Dr. W. Witkowski, and Dr. J. Zieniukowa. Prof. Polański prepared the Sorbian section which appears here in a shortened and modified form. Dr. J. Jerković of Belgrade was kind enough to check the Serbian section. To all of them I express here my sincere thanks.